1	AMELIA ANN ALBANO, CITY ATTORNE	Y FILINGING EXEMPLIPESUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE \$ 6103	
2	(SBN 103640) CAROL A. HUMISTON, SR. ASST. CITY	GOVERNMENT CODE § 6103 2012 APR -2 PM 1: 47	
3	ATTORNEY, (SBN 115592) CITY OF BURBANK	tale with 12 in 1. 47	
4	275 East Olive Avenue P. O. Box 6459		
	Burbank, CA 91510		
5	Tel: (818) 238-5707 Fax: (818) 238-5724		
6	LINDA MILLER SAVITT, SBN 94164 E-mail: LSavitt@brgslaw.com	ITT. LLP	
7	BALLARD ROSENBERG GOLPER & SAV. 500 North Brand Boulevard, 20 th Floor	TT, LLP	
8	Glendale, CA 91203 Tel: (818) 508-3700, Fax: (818) 506-4827		
9			
10	RONALD F. FRANK (SBN 109076) E-mail: rfrank@bwslaw.com		
11	ROBERT J. TYSON (SBN 187311)		
12	E-mail: rtyson@bwslaw.com BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP 444 S. Flower Street, 24 th Floor		
13	Los Angeles, CA 90071		
14	Tel: 213-236-0600 Fax: 213-236-2700		
15	Attorneys for Defendant City of Burbank		
16	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
17			
18			
19	WILLIAM TAYLOR,	Case No. BC 422252 Assigned to: Hon John L. Segal, Dept. 50	
20	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT CITY OF BURBANK'S	
21	v.	OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JUDGMENT	
22	CITY OF BURBANK and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
23	Defendants.	Trial Date: March 5, 2012	
24		Action Filed: Sept. 22, 2009	
25			
26			
27			
28			
IAMS &	LA #4842-2028-5711 v1		
r Law	CTTY OF BUILD AND S OBJECTION	TO DE AINTER'S PROPOSED II INGMENT	

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES

Defendant City of Burbank hereby objects and moves to strike from the "[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT ON GENERAL VERDICT" ("Proposed Judgment") submitted by plaintiff the following provision as follows:

"IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that	
plaintiff William Taylor be granted the following injunctive relief pursuant to	
California Government Code § 12940:	
	-,,

[See Proposed Judgment, p. 3:8-15.]

The inclusion of any language, much less an award, for injunctive relief should be stricken from the judgment. Plaintiff's pleadings do not include any plea for injunctive relief, and any request for such relief has never been tried. Moreover, there is no place for injunctive relief in this case.

The only form of injunctive relief that might have been requested would have been plaintiff's reinstatement. FEHA provides for reinstatement as a remedy, but it may only be coupled with back pay. *Gov. Code* § 12970(a)(1). Front pay is available but only to make an employee whole for what he would have earned from a job he no longer has. *See also Cloud v. Casey* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 895, 910 (back pay and front pay should be calculated to make the employee whole for amount would have made, less earnings in mitigation). Plaintiff requested and the jury awarded front pay in its damages award. Reinstatement would thus be inconsistent with the jury's award. Therefore, it would be improper for plaintiff to seek reinstatement or any other unpleaded injunctive relief in his proposed judgment on the jury verdict.

Moreover, plaintiff elected his remedies—between front pay and any injunctive request for reinstatement—when he sought future lost income (front pay) through his Complaint, First Amended Complaint, economist's testimony at trial, closing argument at trial, and by securing a jury award of front pay. *Frazier v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.* (1985) 169 Cal.App.3d 90, 101 LA #4842-2028-5711 v1 - 1 -

٠ ا	the character characters of the control of the cont		
2	by judgment); Young v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co. (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 1037, 1043, n. 5		
3	(pursuance of remedy to a favorable judgment means an election of remedies has occurred). An		
4	"employer should not be subjected to inconsistent remedial orders." City & County of San		
5	Francisco v. Fair Employment and Housing Commission (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 976, 992-994		
6	(holding state court actions in abeyance where potential for inconsistent relief on employment		
.7	discrimination issues already subject to federal judgment). Plaintiff's consistent election of		
8	monetary damages rather than injunctive relief continues in his proposed judgment. He cannot		
9	recover both damages for future lost income he would have earned from his terminated City		
10	employment and seek injunctive relief in the form of a court order reinstating him to that same		
11	employment.		
12	As such, for all of the foregoing reasons, the Court should sustain the objection and strike		
13	the provision for unstated injunctive relief from the Proposed Judgment.		
14	Dec. 1.34, 1.20, 2012		
15	Dated: March 29, 2012 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP Ronald F. Frank Rohart J. Transport		
16	Robert J. Tyson		
17	Dru A		
18	Robert J. Tyson		
19	Aftorneys for Defendant City of Burbank		
20			
21	V		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES

LA #4842-2028-5711 v1

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 444 South Flower Street, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California 90071-2953. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On March 29, 2012, I placed with this firm at the above address for deposit with the United States Postal Service a true and correct copy of the within document(s):

DEFENDANT CITY OF BURBANK'S OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JUDGMENT

in a sealed envelope, postage fully paid, addressed as follows:

Gregory W. Smith, Esq.

Law Offices of Gregory W. Smith 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 345E Beverly Hills, CA 90212	1528 16th Street Santa Monica, CA 90404
Linda Miller Savitt, Esq. Phillip L. Reznik, Esq. Ballard Rosenberg Golper & Savitt, LLP 500 North Brand Boulevard	Amelia Ann Albano, City Attorney Carol A. Humiston, Sr. Asst. City Attorney 275 East Olive Avenue
20th Floor	Post Office Box 6459
Glendale, CA 91203-9946	Burbank, CA 91510

Following ordinary business practices, the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on this date, and would, in the ordinary course of business, be deposited with the United States Postal Service on this date.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 29, 2012, at Los Angeles, California.

Agnes D. Tualla

Christopher Brizzolara, Esq.

LA #4842-2028-5711 vI

23

24

25

26

27

28